arXiv:0809.0121v1 [math-ph] 31 Aug 2008

On the distribution of linear combinations of eigenvalues of the Anderson model

Shmuel Fishman* and Yevgeny Krivolapov†
Physics Department, Technion - Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa 32000, Israel.

Avy Soffer‡
Mathematics Department, Rutgers University, New-Brunswick, NJ 08903, USA.

(Dated: August 29, 2008)

Abstract

Probabilistic estimates on linear combinations of eigenvalues of the one dimensional Anderson model are derived. So far only estimates on the density of eigenvalues and of pairs were found by Wegner and by Minami. Our work was motivated by perturbative explorations of the Nonlinear Schrödinger Equation, where linear combinations of eigenvalues are the denominators and evaluation of their smallness is crucial.

---

*Electronic address: fishman@physics.technion.ac.il
†Electronic address: evgkr@tx.technion.ac.il
‡Electronic address: soffer@math.rutgers.edu

I. INTRODUCTION

The study of the statistical properties of eigenvalues and their distribution for the Anderson model has attracted a lot of attention in the Mathematical Physics and Physics communities. The one dimensional Anderson model on a lattice can be defined as an eigenvalue problem

$$E\psi_E(x) = \psi_E(x-1) + \psi_E(x+1) + \varepsilon_x \psi_E(x) \qquad x \in \mathbb{Z} \tag{1}$$

where $\psi_E(x)$ is the eigenfunction corresponding to the eigenvalue E. The sites of the lattice are denoted by x while ε_x are independed random variables which are unifomly distributed in the interval $[-\Delta, \Delta]$. It exhibits compelete localization and does not have any exceptional states. Important progress in the understanding of the distribution of eigenvalues has been made at the rigorous level with the fundamental works of Wegner [1] (also see e.g. Aizenman-Molchanov (AM) [2]) and Minami [3, 4], which describes the main aspects of the distribution of the distances between the eigenvalues. Wegner's estimate shows that the typical distance is of order $1/V$, where V is the volume of the cutoff Hamiltonian. A lot of numerical and other arguments, led to the conjecture that the distribution of the distances between eigenvalues (EV) comes as from a Poissonian distribution, and the probability to have two EVs in an interval of size I is proportional to I^2. This last statement was finally proved by Minami [3]. Very recently, we showed that the distribution of the energy level distances, and higher order combinations are crucial to understanding of the large time behavior of the Nonlinear Schrödinger Equation (NLSE) with the Anderson potential in its linear part [5]. This can be understood when one studies the appropriate time dependent perturbative construction of the solution, around the linear part. Then, the leading potentially large terms consist of denominators which are linear combinations (with integer coefficients) of the various EVs of the linear or renormalized linear problem. Thus we are naturally led to consider the probabilistic estimates on the smallness of quantities like

$$f = \sum_{k=1}^{R} c_k E_{i_k} \tag{2}$$

where the sum over k is finite. Here c_k are integers and E_i are the eigenvalues of the Anderson model (1). The indexing of the EV we use is such that to E_i corresponds the eigenfunction which is localized around the lattice site i [7, 8].

Very recently progress on this problem has been achieved in the works [6] and [9]. Our aim in this work is to obtain the needed estimates for the perturbative construction of large time solutions for the NLSE with Anderson potentials [10] , as developed in [5, 11]. Our strategy is to begin with the AM approach [2], and estimate the expectations of fractional powers of the inverse of the linear combinations of EVs, denoted by f (Sec. III). It turns out that the critical step in this problem is to estimate from above the probability of avoided crossings, which is equivalent to controlling the probability of states, with two humps that are far away. Another useful tool is the demonstration of a **lower** bound on the eigenfunctions, which is uniform in the potential, with large probability (Sec. II). A modified version of f is considered in Sec. IV.

II. THE ASYMPTOTIC EXPONENTIAL DECAY OF THE EIGENSTATES

For each energy E the inverse localization length, $\gamma(E)$, is continuous as a result of the Thouless formula [12] and, $\gamma(E) > 0$ (see more details after (17)). Since the spectrum of a Hamiltonian H on a lattice is compact, it follows that, given $\bar{\eta}$, we can cover it with a finite collection of open intervals, such that each interval is around λ_k, $k = 1, 2...K < \infty$, and for energies in that interval $(1-\bar{\eta})\gamma(\lambda_k) \leq \gamma(E) \leq (1+\bar{\eta})\gamma(\lambda_k)$, where $\bar{\eta}$ is arbitrarily small.

Now we focus on one of such intervals located around the energy $\lambda_0 \in I_0$, and fixed $\varepsilon \ll 2\bar{\eta}\gamma(\lambda_0)$. We denote by $s_{n,j}$ the set of all the potentials for which the energy $E_j \in I_0$, and such that,

$$\left|e^{(\gamma(E_j)+\varepsilon)|x|}\psi_{E_j}(x)\right| \geq 1 \qquad j \in \mathbb{Z} \tag{3}$$

the inequality holds for all $|x| \geq n(\bar{\eta}, \varepsilon)$, and x is the distance from the localization center of the wave function. It is a consequence of the Furstenberg theorem [13] and of the analysis of [14] that n is finite for a.e. potential (for an alternative approach see [15]).

The measure of the potentials belonging to $s_{n,j}$ is denoted by $S_{n,j}$. Clearly, $S_{n,j} \geq 0$, and we only consider the case where the measure of the set of potentials with E_j belonging to the interval around λ_0 is nonzero. $S_{n,j}$ is a monotonic increasing sequence of n: this follows since by construction, if $S_{n,j}$ is such that condition (3) is satisfied for $|x| \geq n_j$ it is also satisfied for $|x| \geq n_j + l$, $l > 0$. Furthermore, one can verify that each $S_{n,j}$ is measurable.

Lemma 1 *The limit* $\lim_{n\to\infty} S_{n,j} = \mu_0' > 0$, *exists with some positive* μ_0', *where* μ_0' *is the measure of all the potentials, such that* E_j *is in the interval around* λ_0.

Proof. The lemma follows, since by Furstenberg theorem [13] and Delyon-Souillard-Levy [14] for almost all energies the eigenfunctions decay exponentially with the rate $\gamma(E)$:

$$\lim_{x\to\infty}\frac{\ln\left[\left|\psi_{E_j}(x)\right|^2+\left|\psi_{E_j}(x+1)\right|^2\right]}{2x}=\gamma(E_j). \tag{4}$$

Therefore

$$\left(\left|\psi_{E_j}(x)\right|^2+\left|\psi_{E_j}(x+1)\right|^2\right)^{1/2}\asymp P(x)\,e^{-\gamma(E_j)|x|} \tag{5}$$

with $P(x)$ sub-exponentially bounded, above and below (decaying or increasing), and x is the distance from the localization center [16, 17].

Hence

$$\lim_{x\to\infty}\left|e^{(\gamma(E_j)+\varepsilon)|x|}P(x)\,e^{-\gamma(E_j)|x|}\right|=\infty \tag{6}$$

for all $\varepsilon>0$, and therefore for each eigenfunction condition (3) is satisfied for some *finite* n_j. Hence all realizations of the potential satisfy condition (3) for any E_0 in the interval around λ_0 :

$$\mu_0=\mu\,(\text{all potentials})=\mu\left(\bigcup_{n,j}s_{n,j}\right)\leq\sum_{n,j}\mu(s_{n,j}), \tag{7}$$

since $\{n,j\}$ is countable. ■

The lemma holds for each of the open sets around λ_k. Since the number of these sets is finite, then for any fixed n_j the condition (3) is satisfied for a set of realizations with a measure of $1-\delta_j$, where δ_j decreases with n_j.

This leads to the following proposition.

Proposition 2 *(Lower bound on Eigenfunctions) Given* $\varepsilon,\delta>0$, *with probability* $1-\delta$, $\exists\left\{n_j^*(\varepsilon,\delta)\right\}\subseteq\mathbb{N}$, *such that*

$$\left(\left|\psi_{E_j}(n)\right|^2+\left|\psi_{E_j}(n+1)\right|^2\right)^{1/2}\asymp P(n)\,e^{-\gamma(E_j)|n|}\geq e^{-(\gamma(E_j)+\varepsilon)|n|} \tag{8}$$

for all $n\geq n_j^*(\varepsilon,\delta)$, *and where* n *is distance from the localization center. The proof of the upper bound is similar.*

Corollary 3 *For any* $f=\sum_{k=1}^{R}c_kE_{i_k}$, *there is an* x *such that for* $j>|x|$,

$$\Pr\left(\left|\frac{\partial f}{\partial\varepsilon_j}+\frac{\partial f}{\partial\varepsilon_{j+1}}\right|\leq C_j\right)\leq\bar{\delta}(j) \tag{9}$$

where $C_j>e^{-2(\tilde{\gamma}+\varepsilon)j}$ *and* $\bar{\delta}(j)$ *is monotonically decreasing with* j. *The decay rate* $\tilde{\gamma}$ *corresponds to an energy* E_{i_k} *in the sum for* f, *namely* $\tilde{\gamma}=\gamma(E_{i_k})$.

Proof. Using Feynman-Hellman theorem

$$\left|\frac{\partial f}{\partial \varepsilon_j}+\frac{\partial f}{\partial \varepsilon_{j+1}}\right|=\left|\sum_{k=1}^{R} c_k\left(\left|\psi_{i_k}(j)\right|^2+\left|\psi_{i_k}(j+1)\right|^2\right)\right|. \tag{10}$$

First we order the eigenfunctions in the RHS of (10) by their localization centers, $\{i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_R\}$, where R is the number of eigenfunctions in the sum. If the eigenfunctions are tightly packed in the sense, that their localization centers are found in a box of size $n^*(\varepsilon,\delta)$ then we can take j such that $|j-i_R| > n^*(\varepsilon,\delta)$ and Proposition 2 would apply for all the eigenfunctions in the sum. We assume for simplicity $j>0$. Here $n^*(\varepsilon,\delta) \equiv \sup_{l\epsilon\{i_m\}_{m=1}^{R}} n_l^*(\varepsilon)$. For j large enough the asymptotic behavior of this sum is dictated by one term with the smallest inverse localization length, $\tilde{\gamma}$. In the worst case, there are two states which are localized at a distance of n^* apart on the lattice and have very close inverse localization lengths $\tilde{\gamma},(\tilde{\gamma}\pm\eta)$, with η small. By continuity of $\gamma(E)$ the respective energies are typically close. For these states we have to go for a distance of

$$j > \gamma_{\min} n^*/\eta, \tag{11}$$

where $\gamma_{\min}=\inf_E \gamma(E)$. This results from the requirement that $e^{-\gamma_{\min} j} \gg e^{-(\gamma_{\min}+\eta)(j-n^*)}$, which is satisfied for $e^{(\gamma_{\min}+\eta)n^*-\eta j} \ll 1$. We will disregard realizations of the potentials for which many $\gamma's$ are closer than η, however we notice that the measure of such realizations goes to zero with η. In fact the smallest energy spacing results from avoided crossings which are exponentially small in n^*. In this process we practically eliminated realizations where arbitrarily small energy differences are found. (See next section for detailed discussion of this issue, a quantitative estimate is (19)). For a general configuration of the localization centers in the sum we will separate the localization centers to clusters such that the distance between two adjacent clusters is at least $n^*\gamma_{\min}/\eta$. Following from above, there are intervals on the lattice between the clusters, such that the contribution of each cluster to the sum is governed by one exponential. Therefore we can always find $j's$ between the clusters such that only one cluster and actually one state dominates, moreover at this point the magnitude of the sum satisfies the inequality

$$C_j \geq e^{-\gamma_{\max}\gamma_{\min} n^*/\eta}, \tag{12}$$

where $\gamma_{\max}=\sup_E \gamma(E)$. In this way we obtain the following proposition.

Proposition 4 *Given* R *energies* $E_{i_1}, E_{i_2}, ..., E_{i_R}$ *we can always decompose this set into a set of disjoint clusters such that the largest* n^* *is* cR/γ_{min}*, where with probability* $1-\varepsilon$*, for* $j > n^*(\varepsilon, R)$

$$\sum_{k=1}^{R} c_k \left|\psi_{E_{i_k}}(j)\right|^2 \geq c e^{-2(\tilde{\gamma}+\varepsilon)|j|},$$

with c_k *that are integers and* c *is a constant. That is for some* j*, some* $\left|\psi_{E_{i_k}}(j)\right|^2$ *dominates all other* $\left|\psi_{E_{i_k}}(j)\right|^2$*.*

Using the above proposition we can find an x, such that for $j > x$, the sum (10) will be dominated by one term with the smallest $\gamma(E)$, such that

$$\Pr\left(\left|\frac{\partial f}{\partial \varepsilon_j}\right| \leq C_j\right) \leq \bar{\delta}(j), \tag{13}$$

and C_j depends only on the relative distance between j and the localization center of the dominant eigenfunction, and therefore does not depend on the locations of the other localization centers of the states in f. Here $\bar{\delta}(j)$ is the measure of all the realizations that were excluded so that Proposition 2 holds. Due to the Proposition 2 both C_j and $\bar{\delta}(j)$, confined with (11) are decreasing functions of j. Therefore C_j and $\bar{\delta}(j)$ are bounded by C_x and $\bar{\delta}(x)$ ■

III. THE INTEGRAL OVER $|f|^{-s}$

Lemma 5 *For each* j*, exists a finite interval* $\Delta\varepsilon_j > 0$ *for which the function* $\frac{\partial f}{\partial \varepsilon_j} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial \varepsilon_{j+1}}$ *does not change sign with probability* $1 - \bar{\delta}_1(j)$

Proof. The function $\frac{\partial f}{\partial \varepsilon_j} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial \varepsilon_{j+1}}$ is given by

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial \varepsilon_j} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial \varepsilon_{j+1}} = \sum_{k=1}^{R} c_k \left(\left|\psi_{E_{i_k}}(j)\right|^2 + \left|\psi_{E_{i_k}}(j+1)\right|^2\right). \tag{14}$$

Due to Corollary 3 there is a $j \geq j_0$ for which the sum is dominated by only one term with the smallest $\gamma(E)$. We will denote the state corresponding to this energy by its eigenvalue E_j^0. The sign of $\frac{\partial f}{\partial \varepsilon_j} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial \varepsilon_{j+1}}$ can change only when there is an avoided crossing between the E_j^0 state and one of the other states E_k, in the sum defining f, since then the dominating terms will interchange due to the fact that $\gamma(E)$ is a continuous function of E. Consider a cluster of size L, which is large enough to cover all the eigenstates, such that outside of this cluster the relevant eigenstates are smaller than $e^{-\gamma_{\min} n^*}$. Using this cluster, the Minami estimate [3] gives

$$\Pr\left(TrP^{(L)}_{H_\omega}(I) \geq 2\right) \leq \left(\pi \|\rho\|_\infty IL\right)^2, \tag{15}$$

where $\|\rho\|_\infty$ is the supremum of the density of states, I is some energy interval while $P^{(L)}_{H_\omega}(I)$ is the spectral projection on that interval. We can reformulate this estimate in such a manner that the probability to find any i and k with energies in this interval satisfies

$$\Pr\left(|E_i - E_k| \leq I\right) \leq \left(\pi \|\rho\|_\infty IL\right)^2. \tag{16}$$

Dividing the spectrum into intervals of length $I = \delta_1 L^{-\nu}$ with $\delta_1 > 0$ and $\nu > 2$, we find that the probability to find any pair i, k in such an interval satisfies

$$\Pr\left(|E_i - E_k| \leq \delta_1 L^{-\nu}\right) \leq \delta_1 \Delta \pi^2 \|\rho\|^2_\infty L^{-(2\nu-2)}. \tag{17}$$

Therefore the probability of an energy interchange can be made arbitrarily small. After the interchange of the energies the magnitudes of the corresponding $\gamma's$ will interchange and one (different) state will dominate at j. This assumes that $d\gamma/dE$ for this state is not too small. If it vanishes the following evaluation is required. In this situation, the change in γ for a small change δ_3 in E, we assume that there is a finite number of points, N_b, where the derivative of $\gamma(E)$ is zero, which follows from the analyticity of $\gamma(E)$, that in turn follows from the Thouless formula [12] and the analyticity of the density of states [18, 19, 20]. We take a small interval, δ_2, around those points for which, $d\gamma/dE \leq \delta_2$. We will exclude realizations with energies which are found within this interval, by using the Minami estimate,

$$\Pr\left(|E_i - E_k| \leq I(\delta_2)\right) \leq N_b \left(\pi \|\rho\|_\infty I(\delta_2) L\right)^2 \leq \tilde{\delta}_1(j). \tag{18}$$

where $I(\delta_2)$ is the interval of energies for which , $d\gamma/dE \leq \delta_2$. This interval, $I(\delta_2)$, is a monotonically decreasing function of δ_2. Energies which are found outside of this interval will have a derivative $d\gamma/dE \geq \delta_2$ and therefore using (17)

$$\Pr\left(|\gamma(E_i - \gamma(E_j)| \leq \delta_1 \delta_2 L^{-\nu}\right) \leq \pi^2 \delta_1 \Delta \|\rho\|^2_\infty L^{-(2\nu-2)} \leq \tilde{\delta}_2(j). \tag{19}$$

where $\tilde{\delta}_2(j)$ can be made arbitrarily small. Here we choose L to be much larger than the cluster in question. To ensure that this probability is small we have to choose $\nu > 2$. Note that the number of intervals grows as L^ν. The realizations which are excluded are of probability which is bounded by $\bar{\delta}_1(j) = \tilde{\delta}_1(j) + \tilde{\delta}_2(j)$. ■

Remark 6 *The bound on the probability of the previous corollary should be modified with $\bar{\delta}_j$ replaced by $\bar{\delta}(j) + \bar{\delta}_1(j)$.*

Theorem 7 *For $f = \sum_{k=1}^{R} c_k E_{i_k}$,the following mean is bounded from above*

$$\left\langle \frac{1}{|f|^s} \right\rangle_\delta = \int \prod_{i=1}^{|\Lambda|} d\mu\left(\varepsilon_i\right) \frac{1}{|f|^s} \leq D_\delta . \tag{20}$$

where $\langle . \rangle_\delta$ denotes a mean over realizations of a measure $1-\delta$ and D_δ is independent of $|\Lambda|$ .We analyze the behavior of the integral

$$I_f \equiv \int \prod_{i=1}^{|\Lambda|} d\mu\left(\varepsilon_i\right) \frac{1}{\left|f\left(\vec{\varepsilon}\right)\right|^s} \tag{21}$$

Proof. We denote, $\vec{\varepsilon} \equiv \left\{\varepsilon_{1,} \cdots \varepsilon_{|\Lambda|}\right\}$, and assume, that $\mu\left(\varepsilon_i\right)$ is uniform in the interval $[-\Delta, \Delta]$. We first change variables (for a j chosen to optimize the bound on (22)) to

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_j^+ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\varepsilon_j + \varepsilon_{j+1}\right) \\ \varepsilon_j^- &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\varepsilon_j - \varepsilon_{j+1}\right) \end{aligned}$$

with the Jacobian equal to 1. Then we change the variables to $\left(f, \varepsilon_1, \ldots, \varepsilon_j^-, \varepsilon_{j+1}, \ldots \varepsilon_{|\Lambda|}\right)$, that produces the Jacobian

$$\frac{\partial\left(f, \varepsilon_1, \ldots, \varepsilon_{|\Lambda|}\right)}{\partial\left(\varepsilon_1, \ldots, \varepsilon_{|\Lambda|}\right)} = \left| \begin{array}{cccc} \frac{\partial f}{\partial \varepsilon_j^+} & \frac{\partial f}{\partial \varepsilon_1} & \cdots & \frac{\partial f}{\partial \varepsilon_{|\Lambda|}} \\ & 1 & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & 1 \end{array} \right| = \left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial \varepsilon_j^+} \right| . \tag{22}$$

The integral using the new variables is

$$I_f = \frac{1}{(2\Delta)^{|\Lambda|}} \int d\varepsilon_j^- \int_{-\Delta}^{\Delta} \prod_{i=1, i\neq j}^{|\Lambda|} d\varepsilon_i \int_{f\left(\vec{\varepsilon}, -\vec{\Delta}\right)}^{f\left(\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\Delta}\right)} \left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial \varepsilon_j^+} \right|^{-1} df \frac{1}{|f|^s} . \tag{23}$$

In order to take into the account the multiplicity, which results of this change of variables, we will divide the range of integration in the $\vec{\varepsilon}$ space into domains m_l, $l = 1, ..., M$, such that in each domain the sign of the Jacobian does not change. This results in

$$I_f = \frac{1}{(2\Delta)^{|\Lambda|}} \sum_{l=1}^{M} \int_{m_l} \prod_{i=1, i\neq j}^{|\Lambda|} d\varepsilon_i \int_{f_l^-}^{f_l^+} \left|J_l\right| \; df \frac{1}{|f|^s} \tag{24}$$

where J_l is the Jacobian $\left|\frac{\partial f}{\partial \varepsilon_j^+}\right|^{-1}$ in the $l-th$ domain and $f_l^{\pm}$ are the extremal values of f in this domain. Such splitting into a finite number of domains is possible due to Lemma 5 and since $\left|\frac{\partial f}{\partial \varepsilon_j^+}\right| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left|\frac{\partial f}{\partial \varepsilon_j} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial \varepsilon_{j+1}}\right|$. Since the integrand is positive the value of the integral can be only increased by increasing the integration volume. Therefore we obtain the following inequality

$$|f| = \left|\sum_{k=1}^{R} c_k E_{i_k}\right| \leq \max_{\omega} |E_{i_k}| \sum_k |c_k| = (2+\Delta)\sum_k |c_k| \leq Q \tag{25}$$

where we have used the fact that the eigenvalues are bounded and the sum is finite. The integral can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} I_f &= \frac{1}{(2\Delta)^{|\Lambda|}} \sum_{l=1}^{M} \int_{m_l} \prod_{i=1, i\neq j}^{|\Lambda|} d\varepsilon_i \int_{f_l^-}^{f_l^+} |J_l| \; df \frac{1}{|f|^s} \\ &\leq \int_0^Q df \frac{1}{f^s} \sup_{\{\varepsilon_i\}} \left(\left|\frac{\partial f}{\partial \varepsilon_j^+}\right|^{-1} \right) \left(\frac{1}{(2\Delta)^{|\Lambda|}} \sum_{l=1}^{M} \int_{m_l} \prod_{i=1, i\neq j}^{|\Lambda|} d\varepsilon_i \right) \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

with $|J_l| \leq \sup_{\{\varepsilon_i\}} \left(\left|\frac{\partial f}{\partial \varepsilon_j^+}\right|^{-1} \right)$. The last term is an integral over all ε_j excluding one, therefore the volume transforms as

$$\left(\frac{1}{(2\Delta)^{|\Lambda|}} \sum_{l=1}^{M} \int_{m_l} \prod_{i=1, i\neq j}^{|\Lambda|} d\varepsilon_i \right) = \frac{1}{2\Delta}. \tag{27}$$

Using Corollary 3 and Remark 6 the integral can be further bounded by

$$I_f \leq C_\delta^{-1} \frac{Q^{1-s}}{2\Delta\,(1-s)} \equiv D_\delta \tag{28}$$

with D_δ independent of of the size of system and of R while C_δ is the smallest C_j. ■

IV. THE EFFECT OF RENORMALIZATION

In some applications [5, 11] the function $f = \sum_k c_k E_{i_k}$ should be replaced by $f' = \sum_k c_k E'_{i_k}$, where E'_i are the renormalized energies and $f' = f + \beta F(\{\overrightarrow{\varepsilon}\})$. In this application, to the leading order only one energy denoted by E_0 is renormalized, namely

$$E'_i = E_i + \beta \delta_{i,0} V_0^{000}$$

where β is a small parameter and $V_0^{000} = \sum_i \psi_{E_0}^4(i)$. We show that to this order C_δ is not affected by F for $\beta <$const $e^{-2(\gamma_{\max}-\gamma_{\min})|x_\delta|}$, where $\gamma_{\min}$ and $\gamma_{\max}$ are the minimal and the maximal Lyapunov exponents and $|x_\delta|$ is defined by $C_\delta = (C_j, j = x_\delta)$.

The derivative of V_0^{000} is given by

$$\frac{\partial V_0^{000}}{\partial \varepsilon_j} = \sum_i 4\psi_{E_0}^3(i) \frac{\partial \psi_{E_0}(i)}{\partial \varepsilon_j}. \tag{29}$$

Lemma 8

$$\Pr\left(\left| \frac{\partial V_0^{000}}{\partial \varepsilon_j^+} \right| \geq D e^{-2(\gamma_{\min} - \eta)|x_j|} \right) \leq e^{-2\eta s |x_j|} \qquad 0 < s < 1 \tag{30}$$

where $\gamma_{\min}$ is the minimal Lyapunov exponent.

Proof. Using a perturbation expansion in ε_j (to the first order), this derivative, $\frac{\partial \psi_{E_n}(i)}{\partial \varepsilon_j}$, can be calculated

$$\frac{\partial \psi_{E_n}(i)}{\partial \varepsilon_j} = \psi_{E_n}(j) \sum_{k \neq n} \frac{\psi_{E_k}(j)\, \psi_{E_k}(i)}{E_n - E_k}. \tag{31}$$

We now use the fractional moment technique to get a probabilistic bound on this derivative. Using the bound on the eigenfunctions and the estimate on the average of $\left\langle \frac{1}{|E_n - E_k|^s} \right\rangle_\delta$, (see Theorem 7), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle \left| \frac{\partial \psi_{E_n}(i)}{\partial \varepsilon_j} \right|^s \right\rangle_\delta &= \left\langle |\psi_{E_n}(j)|^s \left| \sum_{k \neq n} \frac{\psi_{E_k}(j)\, \psi_{E_k}(i)}{E_n - E_k} \right|^s \right\rangle_\delta \qquad (32) \\ &\leq \sup_\omega \left(|\psi_{E_n}(j)|^s \sum_{k \neq n} |\psi_{E_k}(j)|^s |\psi_{E_k}(i)|^s \right) \left\langle \frac{1}{|E_n - E_k|^s} \right\rangle_\delta \\ &\leq \bar{D}_\varepsilon D_\delta e^{-\gamma_{\min} s |x_j - x_n|} e^{-\gamma_{\min} s |x_j - x_i|}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore the derivative $\frac{\partial V_0^{000}}{\partial \varepsilon_j}$ (where $x_0 = 0$), can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle \left| \frac{\partial V_0^{000}}{\partial \varepsilon_j} \right|^s \right\rangle_\delta &\leq 4 \bar{D}_\varepsilon D_\delta e^{-\gamma_{\min} s |x_j|} \sum_i e^{-3\gamma_{\min} s |x_i|} e^{-\gamma_{\min} s |x_j - x_i|} \qquad (33) \\ &\leq 4 \bar{D}_\varepsilon D_\delta e^{-2\gamma_{\min} s |x_j|} \sum_i e^{-2\gamma_{\min} s |x_i|} = \tilde{D}_\varepsilon D_\delta e^{-2\gamma_{\min} s |x_j|}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the definition of ε_j^+

$$\left\langle \left| \frac{\partial V_0^{000}}{\partial \varepsilon_j^+} \right|^s \right\rangle_\delta \leq \frac{1}{2^{s/2}} \left(\left\langle \left| \frac{\partial V_0^{000}}{\partial \varepsilon_j} \right|^s \right\rangle_\delta + \left\langle \left| \frac{\partial V_0^{000}}{\partial \varepsilon_{j+1}} \right|^s \right\rangle_\delta \right) \leq \tilde{D}_\varepsilon D_\delta e^{-2\gamma_{\min} s |x_j|}$$

Utilizing the Chebychev inequality we complete the proof. ■

Remark 9 *Since the derivative $\frac{\partial V_0^{000}}{\partial \varepsilon_j}$ is bounded from above we can always select β in such way that its contribution will be smaller than the derivatives of the energies.*

Acknowledgments

This work was partly supported by the Israel Science Foundation (ISF), by the US-Israel Binational Science Foundation (BSF), by the USA National Science Foundation (NSF), by the Minerva Center of Nonlinear Physics of Complex Systems, by the Shlomo Kaplansky academic chair and by the Fund for promotion of research at the Technion. We had illuminating and informative discussions with many of our colleagues. Of particular importance were the discussion with M. Aizenman, I. Goldshield, M. Golsdtein, W.-M. Wang and S. Warzel.

---

[1] F. Wegner, Z. Physik **B 44**, 9 (1981).
[2] M. Aizenman and S. Molchanov, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **157**, 245 (1993).
[3] N. Minami, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **177**, 709 (1996).
[4] G.M. Graf and A. Vaghi, A remark on the estimate of a determinant by Minami. (English summary) *Lett. Math. Phys.* **79,** 17 (2007). (arXiv:math-ph/0604033)
[5] S. Fishman, Y. Krivolapov and A. Soffer, *J. Stat. Phys.* **131**, 843 (2008).
[6] M. Aizenman and S. Warzel, On the Joint Distribution of Energy Levels of Random Schroedinger Operators, arXiv:0804.4231 [math-ph] (2008).
[7] J.M. Combes, F. Germinet and A. Klein, Generalized eigenvalue-counting estimates for the Anderson model, arXiv:0804.3202 [math-ph] (2008).
[8] A. Klein and S. Molchanov, J. Stat. Phys. **122**, 95 (2006).
[9] J.-M. Combes, F. Germinet, A and Klein, Poisson Statistics for Eigenvalues of Continuum Random Schrödinger Operators, arXiv:0807.0455 [math-ph] (2008).
[10] W.-M. Wang and Z. Zhang, Long time Anderson localization for nonlinear random Schroedinger equation, arXiv:0805.3520 [math-ph] (2008).
[11] S. Fishman, Y. Krivolapov and A. Soffer, in preparation
[12] D.J. Thouless, *J. Phys. C: Solid State Phys.* **5**, 77 (1972).
[13] H. Furstenberg, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **108**, 377 (1963).
[14] F. Delyon, Y. Levy and B. Souillard, *J. Stat. Phys.* **41**, 375 (1985); *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **55**, 618 (1985).

[15] A. Klein, F. Martinelli and F. Perez, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **106**, 623 (1986).

[16] R. del Rio, S. Jitomirskaya, Y. Last, and B. Simon, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 117 (1995); *J. Anal. Math.* **69**, 153-200 (1996).

[17] F. Germinet and A. Klein, *J. Stat. Phys.* **122**, 73 (2006); arXiv:math-ph/0503017.

[18] P.D. Hislop, F. Klopp and J.H.Schenker, *Illinois J. Math.* **49**, 893 (2005) (electronic), arXiv:math-ph/0409007.

[19] J.H. Schenker, *Lett. Math. Phys.* **70**, 195 (2004), arXiv:math-ph/0403063.

[20] B. Simon and M. Taylor, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **106**, 623 (1986).